

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ENITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Enited States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virgnia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/620,452	10/620,452 07/17/2003		Akihisa Hongo	2003_0979	9165
513	7590	03/03/2005	•	EXAMINER	
WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.				· VINH, LAN	
2033 K ST SUITE 800		W.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHING	OTON, DO	C 20006-1021		1765	
			•	DATE MAILED: 03/03/2005	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			4)
)	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/620,452	HONGO ET AL.	t
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lan Vinh	1765	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence address	-
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, and If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may be a searned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thir od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become Al	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	t
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17	' July 2003.		
· <u> </u>	his action is non-final.	·	
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice unde	vance except for formal matt	•	ŧ
Disposition of Claims			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.		ı
Application Papers	•		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examination The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) and a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is a bijected to by the	ccepted or b) objected to he drawing(s) be held in abeyar ection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d)	,) .
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action of form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documed 2. Certified copies of the priority documed 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documed application from the International Bured * See the attached detailed Office action for a life section for a life sec	ents have been received. ents have been received in A riority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No. <u>09/572432</u> . received in this National Stage	·
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 71703.	Paper No(s	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	19

Art Unit: 1765

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 2. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uzoh (US 6,056,869) in view of Chen (US 5,723,387)

Uzoh discloses a method for electrochemically deplating metal from side edges of a semiconductor wafer. The method comprises the steps of:

depositing/plating a metal film onto a surface of seed layer of a substrate (col 4, lines 4-6)

in a shaped cathode/cleaning section, ejecting an etching solution onto the side edge/peripheral portion of the metal film for removing side edge portion of the metal film while holding and rotating the wafer/substrate (col 7, lines 62-65; col 8, lines 49-56). Fig. 3a of Uzoh shows the metal film plated facing upwardly

Art Unit: 1765

Unlike the instant claimed inventions as per claims 1, 6, Uzoh fails to specifically disclose plating the metal film in a plating section/plating vessel

Chen discloses a method for forming copper interconnection comprises the step of plating the metal film in a plating section/plating vessel (col 5, lines 23-25)

Thus, one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to modify Uzoh by plating the metal film in a plating section/plating vessel as per Chen because according to Chen plating the metal film in a plating section provides a thick layer of Cu in a less stringent clean environment (col 6, lines 65-67)

Regarding claim 2, Uzoh discloses directing the electrolyte/cleaning onto a backside of the wafer/substrate for removing metal adhered to the backside (col 8, lines 54-56; fig. 3b)

Regarding claim 3, fig. 3a of Uzoh shows that the electrolyte/ cleaning solution is supplied onto a central portion of the substrate for removing metal from the substrate Regarding claim 4, Uzoh discloses that one or more electrolytes/cleaning solution and/or etchant may be directed onto the side edge and central portion of the substrate having the metal film (col 6, lines 12-21; fig. 3a0

Regarding claim 5, Uzoh discloses that the unwanted metal on the backside is entirely removed by the electroyte/cleaning solution (col 8, lines 49-56)

Regarding claims 7-8, Uzoh discloses using a nozzle inclined to a surface of the metal film to eject the electrolyte onto the side edge of the metal film (col 8, lines 14-16, fig. 3b shows the nozzle is spaced a distance from the edge of the substrate

Art Unit: 1765

Regarding claim 9, Uzoh discloses using sulfuric acid in the electrolyte/etchant solution (col 6, lines 23-25)

Regarding claim 10, Uzoh discloses forming Cu film on the substrate (col 4, lines 1-2)
Regarding claim 11, Uzoh discloses flowing DI water through conduit 35 onto the surface of the substrate (col 5, lines 55-65), which reads on washing the metal film plated on the substrate before ejecting the etching solution onto the peripheral of the metal film

Unlike the instant claimed inventions as per claim 12, Uzoh fails to specifically disclose rinsing and drying the substrate after ejecting the etching solution onto the substrate Chen also discloses rinsing and drying the substrate after cleaning the substrate with an etching solution (col 3, lines 50-57)

Thus, one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to modify Uzoh by adding the step of rinsing and drying the substrate after ejecting the etching solution onto the substrate to prepare the substrate for reintroduction into the very clean environment as taught by Chen (col 3, lines 56-58)

Unlike the instant claimed inventions as per claim 13, Uzoh fails to specifically disclose transporting the substrate from the plating section to the cleaning section

Chen also discloses transporting the substrate from the plating section to the cleaning section using automated indexing apparatus (col 5, lines 17-20)

Thus, one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to modify Uzoh method by adding the step of transporting the substrate from the plating section to the cleaning section using indexing apparatus for withdrawal of

Art Unit: 1765

substrate from the chamber for further processing in associated semiconductor manufacturing apparatus that require high clean room environment as taught by Chen (col 6, lines 20-27)

Page 5

Conclusion

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lan Vinh whose telephone number is 571 272 1471. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine Norton can be reached on 571 272 1465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LV

March 1, 2005